



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,528	09/26/2003	Sylvia Monsheimer	236706US6	6515

22850 7590 02/02/2010
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

COZART, JERMIE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3726

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

02/02/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4
5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8
9

10 *Ex parte* SYLVIA MONSHEIMER, RAINER GOERING, and HANS RIES
11
12

13 Appeal 2009-006938
14 Application 10/670,528
15 Technology Center 3700
16
17

18 Oral Hearing Held: January 13, 2010
19
20

21 Before JENNIFER D. BAHR, JOHN C. KERINS, and
22 STEVEN D.A. MCCARTHY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
23
24

25 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:
26

27 JAMES J. KELLY, Ph.D.
28 Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, LLP
29 1940 Duke Street
30 Alexandria, VA 22314
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday,
2 January 13, 2009, commencing at 10:10a.m., at the U.S. Patent and
3 Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Paula
4 Lowery, Notary Public.

5 THE CLERK: Calendar Number 31, Appeal Number 2009-006938, Mr.
6 Kelly.

7 JUDGE BAHR: Good morning.

8 MR. KELLY: Good morning, Your Honors.

9 JUDGE BAHR: You can start whenever you're ready.

10 MR. KELLY: We're claiming a composite part produced by connecting a
11 plastic pipe to another plastic part.

12 The most important feature that brings us here today is that our other plastic
13 part has at least one nipple providing for the connection of a pipe to where
14 the nipple is provided on the outside of the profile. It's used to fuse or
15 connect the plastic pipe and this other plastic part.

16 The Examiner cited two references against us. The first reference is this
17 Savitski patent. The important feature of this first reference is that the joint -
18 - actually, the connection that's produced when the two parts are fused
19 together, you have simultaneous lap and butt joints.

20 My understanding of a butt joint is simply you have two ends of two pipes,
21 or two connectors. You bring the ends in proximity, and then you treat them
22 in such a way as to melt them or soften them with a solvent, and you fuse
23 them together to create a butt joint.

24 So the reference is very clear that when these two pieces are connected, you
25 get both a lap joint and a butt joint. That's in the Abstract, the first line, and
26 it's also in the "Background of the Invention" section, Column 1; and in the

1 “Field of the Invention,” right about line 19. There's several other places
2 where the butt joint is described.
3 Now, the Examiner recognizes that this primary reference Savitski does not
4 describe the use of a nipple. However, the Examiner has cited the secondary
5 reference Fisher-Keller, which you can see in Figure 3, contains a nipple. I
6 believe that's item 14 -- reference 14.

7 The Examiner has taken the position that it's obvious to one skilled in the art
8 to take the nipple that's described in Fisher-Keller and use it in the method
9 and product that's obtained in the Savitski patent.

10 It's our position that while the primary reference doesn't explicitly exclude
11 the possibility of using a nipple, the fact that you're forming a butt joint
12 implicitly teaches away from the use of a nipple.

13 Because as you can see in the figure on the front page of the Fisher-Keller
14 reference, which I believe is a reproduction of Figure 3, when you use a
15 nipple and connect that way, you simply don't form a butt joint. It's just not
16 the product.

17 JUDGE MCCARTHY: Counsel, does Savitski give any reason why it is
18 desirable to have both a butt and lap joint?

19 MR. KELLY: In Column 2 Savitski states, this is in the back of the
20 invention section after describing -- I'm sorry.

21 I don't know if there's a discussion of that. I'm not finding it looking at the
22 reference now.

23 JUDGE MCCARTHY: If I understand correctly, Savitski doesn't criticize
24 or disparage the use of a nipple along with a laser welding, according to
25 Savitski's method?

26 MR. KELLY: I believe there's no explicit teaching against using a nipple.

1 JUDGE MCCARTHY: If I'm not mistaken, the Examiner says that it would
2 be obvious to combine a nipple, as taught by Fisher-Keller, with Savitski's
3 welding method in order to preposition the two pipes or the pipe and other
4 plastic part with respect to each other before welding.

5 Is the Examiner's reasoning faulty in some particular way?

6 MR. KELLY: Is that in the final rejection? I'm just trying to find --

7 JUDGE MCCARTHY: In the Answer at the bottom of page 4.

8 MR. KELLY: I'm not aware that that statement is incorrect. I'd just point
9 out that if you did use a nipple, as the Examiner suggests, you would not end
10 up with the butt joint that's explicitly taught and required by the Savitski
11 reference.

12 JUDGE MCCARTHY: Please continue with your argument.

13 MR. KELLY: So in summary, there's no explicit teaching away from using
14 a nipple in Savitski, but the description and requirement for a butt joint
15 provides an implicit teaching away.

16 JUDGE MCCARTHY: So I take it it's your position that one of ordinary
17 skill in the art at the time your client's invention was made would not have
18 been able to, through the exercise of common sense, step beyond the
19 particular teaching of a butt joint and use -- combine a nipple as taught by
20 Fisher-Keller with the method of Savitski?

21 MR. KELLY: I wouldn't characterize it as use of common sense. I would
22 say that there's no motivation to do so.

23 JUDGE MCCARTHY: So your position is that obviousness can't be found
24 unless there is some particularized motivation to make the combination?

25 MR. KELLY: In this particular case where the reference specifically

1 requires the formation of one specific type of connection, there would be no
2 motivation to modify the teaching of that reference so that it wasn't formed.

3 JUDGE MCCARTHY: But wouldn't the Examiner's reasoning at the
4 bottom of page 4 of the Answer, or what I just referred to a few minutes ago,
5 provide one of ordinary skill in the art reason to make the combination?
6 Namely to enable preassembly of the pipe and other plastic part?

7 MR. KELLY: In this case I don't have an explicit argument against that
8 statement. It's just that if you use a nipple in this case, you don't form a butt
9 joint.

10 JUDGE BAHR: Do you have anything else you want to add?

11 MR. KELLY: That's it.

12 JUDGE BAHR: We'll take this case under advisement. Thank you.

13 Whereupon, the proceedings at 10:20 a.m. were concluded.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23